



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,143	09/25/2001	James Hugh McLaughlin	077698-0012	1702
20277	7590	06/03/2008		
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 13TH STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			EXAMINER	WANG, SHENGJUN
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1617				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/03/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/964,143	MC LAUGHLIN, JAMES HUGH	
	<b>Examiner</b>	Art Unit	
	Shengjun Wang	1617	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Shengjun Wang. (3) James Hugh McLaughlin.  
 (2) Cameron K. Weiffenbach; Kenneth L. Cage. (4) Lauren Trahan.

Date of Interview: 27 May 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: The particular composition within the claimed invention as described in the declaration submitted 12/31/2007 was presented. Compositions based on the prior art were also presented.

Claim(s) discussed: All the pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: All the cited prior art.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented arguments that the claimed composition has superior properties over the composition of prior art. Applicant demonstrated properties of the inventive example and the examples based on the prior art. The declaration submitted 12.31.2007 was discussed. The scope of claimed invention was also discussed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Shengjun Wang/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1617  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.